

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: "Nawi, David"
Sent: Tue 4/17/2012 7:28:10 PM
Subject: RE: Purpose and Need - Again
mailto:David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov

Loop never closed with DWR. I think we will do that in the next few days. I will strongly support no change, and I predict that will be the outcome (hope I am not proven wrong).i

From: Tom Hagler [<mailto:Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 12:20 PM
To: Nawi, David
Cc: Karen Schwinn
Subject: Fw: Purpose and Need - Again

EPA would like to say that we are done with the NEPA P+N, but we aren't sure whether we finally resolved the issue below.

Our recollection was that you were going to check with Mike Connor on this whole brouhaha about changing "would" to "could."

Did this ever get resolved, or are we still in limbo?

(The exchange is summarized in your email from 03/14 below).

Tom Hagler
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, RC-2
San Francisco, California 94105-3901
Phone: (415) 972-3945
Email: hagler.tom@epamail.epa.gov
----- Forwarded by Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US on 04/17/2012 11:45 AM -----

From: "Nawi, David" <David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov>
To: "Rinek, Lori" <lori_rinek@fws.gov>, Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, "Idlof, Patricia S (Patti)" <Pidlof@usbr.gov>, "Allen, Kaylee" <Kaylee.Allen@sol.doi.gov>, Deanna Harwood <deanna.harwood@noaa.gov>, "Monroe, Jim" <James.Monroe@sol.doi.gov>, Michael Tucker <Michael.Tucker@NOAA.GOV>, "Barajas, Federico" <FBarajas@usbr.gov>
Cc: "Belin, Letty" <Letty_Belin@ios.doi.gov>, "Sobeck, Eileen" <Eileen_Sobeck@ios.doi.gov>

Date: 03/14/2012 01:56 PM
Subject: Purpose and Need - Again

(b) (5)



David

----- Message from "Cowin, Mark" <mcowin@water.ca.gov> on Thu, 23 Feb 2012 15:10:14 -0500 -----

To:

"Nawi, David" <David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov>

cc:

"Crothers, Cathy" <crothers@water.ca.gov>

Subject:

RE: Purpose Statement

Yes, I am OK with this language for the draft.

From: Nawi, David [mailto:David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2012 9:22 AM
To: Cowin, Mark
Subject: FW: Purpose Statement

Mark – Confirming that we are good to go with the language below, and that it will be reflected without further change in the draft DEIS/EIR.

Thanks.

David

From: Nawi, David
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2012 1:12 PM
To: mark.cowin@water.ca.gov
Subject: Purpose Statement

Mark – Would you please give me a call re the Purpose Statement language we discussed last week – set out below.

David

The above Purpose Statement reflects the intent to advance the coequal goals set forth in the Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The above phrase—restore and protect the ability of the SWP and CVP to deliver up to full contract amounts— is related to the upper limit of legal CVP and SWP contractual water amounts and delineates an upper bound for development of EIR/EIS alternatives, not a target. It is not intended to imply that increased quantities of water will be delivered under the BDCP. As indicated by the "up to full contract amounts" phrase, alternatives need not be capable of delivering full contract amounts on average in order to meet the project purposes. Alternatives that depict design capacities or operational parameters that would result in deliveries of less than full contract amounts are consistent with this purpose.